

In step g) of claim 1 [now step h) of claim 21], the expression "all functional coverage analysis data" has been changed to --analysis logs and traces-- and is more fully described between page 19, line 3, and page 21, line 9, and is shown in Figure 2 as item 166.

In step h) of claim 1, [now step j) in claim 21], "the coverage models" are discussed at page 16, lines 18--22, and are shown as items 154 and 158 in Figure 2.

In step l) of claim 1 [now step m) in claim 21], the objection to "a coverage analysis program" has been overcome by using the word "program", and "architectural coverage models" has been changed to --architectural and microarchitectural coverage models-- to conform more closely to page 16, lines 18 -- 22 of the specification and items 154 and 158 of Figure 2.

In step m) of claim 1 [now step n) of claim 21], "the created coverage models" has been changed to --the created architectural and microarchitectural coverage models--.

Claim 4 has now been rewritten as independent claim 22 wherein the claim language has been changed from "the capability of providing" to --providing--, in conformity with the examiner's suggestion.

Claim 5, "the coverage analysis" has been changed to --the coverage analysis program-- in element l) of claim 22.

Claim 6, "the coverage analysis environment" is referred to generally as 150 in Figure 2, and has been changed to the --architectural and microarchitectural models-- for clarification. These models are discussed at page 16, lines 13--22, and page 18, line 10, through page 19, line 2. They are identified by the symbols 154 and 158 in Figure 2.

Claim 8, "using these as input", has been changed to --using said machine readable coverage analysis models-- in element o) of claim 24 to be more specific. This is described more fully at page 23, line 10, through page 24, line 11 of the specification.

Claim 9, in step b), "the design models" has been changed in new claim 25 to read -- design model simulations -- for clarification following the examiner's recommendation.

In step c) of claim 8, now claim 25, "the test program database" has been changed in element c) of claim 25 to --the test programs database--, again pursuant to the examiner's suggestion.

In step d) of claim 8, [now element e) of claim 25], "storing the models" has been changed to --storing the created models --.

In claim 10 (erroneously referred to as claim 9 by the examiner) "the optimized test specs" has been changed to --optimized test specification-- in element a) of claim 25, to provide proper antecedence.

Claim 12, "these tests" has been changed to --the deterministic tests-- as proposed by the examiner.

Claim 18, which was also objected for many of the same reasons as in the objection of claim 1, has now been canceled.


The objection to claim 20 is moot in view of the cancellation of this claim.

It is believed that all of the claims now in the application are distinguishable one from the other and over the prior art.

Therefore, reconsideration and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: SEPTEMBER 2, 2005


James A. Lucas, Reg. No. 21,081
Attorney for Applicant
CUSTOMER NO. 26675